[5th March 1925

Rao Sahib P. V. GOPALAN :—" May I just ask the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government whether he has received any report either from the District Medical Officer, Malabar, or the Surgeon-General regarding the retention of the Chowghat hospital ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" I do not think we have received any report."

Religious and Charitable Endowments.

Amending Bill to Hindu Religious Endowments Act.

*385 Q.—Mr S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state whether there has been any communication from the Government of India or the Governor-General with regard to an amending Bill to be introduced into the local Council to the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act ?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the press communiqué of 30th January 1925. The Government are not prepared to furnish any further information.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Sir, the press communiqué does not refer to any information from the Government of India or the Governor-General regarding an amending Bill. May I ask the hon. Minister whether he can give any information regarding that ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Besides the press communiqué there is nothing else."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I ask the hon. Minister why he is not prepared to let us know the communication between the Government of Madras and the Government of India ? "

Education.

Distribution of grant to elementary schools.

*386 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the additional grant made for starting new elementary schools has been spent and, if so, how much and in what manner ;

(b) how many new schools have been opened ; the amount given to each local body and the number of new schools started in each ;

(c) the principle observed in the distribution of the grant ;

(d) whether any attention was paid to the poorer local bodies where the educational cess could not be levied ; and

(e) in cases where the educational tax is not collected by members, wilfully, whether Government are withholding the grant and the consequent facilities for the starting of new schools, on the score that a few members of the local bodies are wilfully negligent ?

A.—(a) & (b) The hon. Member is referred to G.O. No. 1598, Law (Education), dated the 16th October 1924. A copy [a] of the order is laid on the table.

[a] Printed as Appendix IV on pages 878—882 infra.

(c) Subsidies have been granted to local bodies which are levying the education tax and are yet unable to open schools in all villages with a population of 1,000 and above unprovided with schools.

(d) & (e) Education tax is being levied in twenty-two out of twenty-five districts in the Presidency. It is not clear what taluk boards the hon. Member has in mind when he refers to the 'poorer' ones; nor can the reference to taluk boards which have wilfully refused to levy the education tax be understood.

Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai.

* 387 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Director of Public Instruction delayed the recognition of the IV and V Forms in the Municipal High School, Tiruvannamalai, and whether the municipal council appealed to Government about it;

(b) whether the subsidy now paid to the institution is not one fixed at a time when the high school had only three forms;

(c) the amount of building and equipment grants granted to the Mission High School at the same place after it was made a high school and the amount of building and equipment grant to the Municipal High School;

(d) whether the municipal council has constructed a building for the high school at a cost of about Rs. 20,000;

(e) whether subsidies to local bodies for maintaining schools are fixed with reference to the net annual cost;

(f) whether the subsidy to this municipal council was not raised, when its net cost of maintaining the high school was raised;

(g) the strength of the high school classes at the end of December 1924, (i) in the Municipal High School and (ii) in the Mission High School; and

(h) the average cost to Government per pupil for education in the high school classes in each of the above high schools?

A.—(a) Forms IV and V in the school were opened in 1921 and 1922, respectively, and the Government approved the action of the Municipal Council in G.O. No. 1934, L. & M., dated 14th October 1922. The Chairman thereafter applied for recognition of those forms and the Inspector of Schools recommended it. The Inspector was informed by the Director of Public Instruction that no formal recognition was necessary as the classes were opened with the permission of the Government.

(b) Yes.

(c) Particulars of grants sanctioned for the Mission High School are not available. Subsidies granted to the Municipal High School are not governed by the rules in Grant-in-Aid Code.

(d) The Chairman reported in September 1924 that the total outlay on the building constructed for the school amounted to Rs. 18,028.

(e) Not in all cases.

(f) No.

(g) & (h) The information is not available.